Gc
974.702
So89how
1552957

M. L.

GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01150 3999

74.7(
689hc
65295

4.7
89h
529

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/whensouthamptons00howe_0

Respects of Geo. R. Howell.

WHEN

SOUTHAMPTON AND SOUTHOLD,

ON

LONG ISLAND,

New York

WERE SETTLED.

BY

GEO. R. HOWELL.

ALBANY:
WEED, PARSONS AND COMPANY, PRINTERS.
1882.

WHEN

SOUTHAMPTON AND SOUTHOLD,

ON

1552957

LONG ISLAND,

WERE SETTLED.

BY

GEO. R. HOWELL.

ALBANY:
WEED, PARSONS AND COMPANY, PRINTERS.
1882.

WHEN

SOUTHAMPTON AND SOUTHOLD,

ON LONG ISLAND,

WERE SETTLED.

The Rev. Dr. Epher Whitaker, in issuing his late history of Southold, has made a praiseworthy contribution to our knowledge of Long Island. Among the natives of this gem of the sea who have found homes elsewhere throughout our broad land, this work of his finds readers as interested as any that still remain in the old birthplace. We, too, are interested in the chronicle of the struggles of these island Puritans to plant anew such homes in this country as should remind them of the ones they had left in England. And although the writer may not look among these worthy pioneers of Southold for his ancestors, still, as this town was almost cotemporaneous in its settlement with his native place, the adjoining town of Southampton, from no one has Dr. Whitaker's book received a warmer welcome than from him. And this in spite of the omission of genealogies of the early settlers, which we hoped would be found there, and in spite also of the fact that the good Doctor still maintains his opinion of the priority of the settlement of the town as compared with that of Southampton, formerly combated by the writer, and now to be assailed once more by the concurrent testimony of every historian who has treated of this subject, with one exception. This exception is Silas Wood, whose history of Long Island placed the

settlement of Southampton in December, 1640, because that was the date of the Indian deed of the town, and because he could not have seen the testimony of several witnesses whom I shall summon to decide this question.

Our author has one singular method of reasoning at the outset. After throwing discredit upon Griffin's Journal — and we all know the genial old gentleman did make mistakes — he quotes Griffin's list of thirteen settlers with the statement of this author that they constituted a portion of the Rev. Mr. Youngs' church in England, and emigrated with him in the summer of 1640, and came from New Haven to Southold in the September following. Then he goes on to say that twelve of these men did not come to America in 1640; that they had been in this country, in various places, for several years preceding. So far we have no criticism to offer; but when Dr. Whitaker draws the large inference from these facts that no portion of Mr. Youngs' English parish could have come over with him to New Haven, and gone thence to Southold, with recruits picked up in various places, he is guilty of a very absurd *non sequitur*. In the long list of 138 men forming Mr. Youngs' parish, given on pages 45–48 of Dr. Whitaker's history, might surely be found ten men who with Mr. Youngs could have formed a church organization at New Haven, after crossing the ocean together. Because certain twelve men did not make up a company of Mr. Youngs' parishioners in England and America, it does not follow that no other twelve men held this relation to him. Still, it is not essential to the time of the settlement that a portion of his English parish also formed a part of his parish at Southold. The point is, when did the company go there to settle from New Haven? They could not have gone there without Youngs, because he was the leader in the enterprise, and he came to America in the summer of 1640.

Dr. Whitaker claims, in his history of Southold, that the original settlers came there before the settlers of Southampton occupied the land now known under that name. This we deny. We claim that Southampton was settled, at the latest, in the early part of June, 1640, and that Southold was settled in October of the same year. Instead of arguing the case again, it is the purpose of the writer to quote all the authorities that are accepted

as standard among historical men, and that throw any light upon this question, and then let the case rest with the public for a verdict.

I may be permitted to cite a fact which I do not find in the history of Southold in reference to the ecclesiastical connection of Mr. Youngs before his emigration. Neal, in his history of New England, published in London in 1720, gives a "list of the names of such Puritan ministers, who were in orders in the Church of England, but being disturbed by the ecclesiastical courts, for the cause of nonconformity, transported themselves to New England, for the free exercise of their ministry before the year 1641." In this list occurs the name of the Rev. Mr. Youngs, of Southold. (Vol. 1, p. 195.)

Dr. Whitaker, in his history of Southold (p. 36), says: "Thompson says that the Rev. John Youngs 'came to New Haven in 1638,' and this statement is likely to hold good."

When a second edition of a work has been published which professes to revise and correct the first, no historian thinks of quoting the first edition as the writer's best knowledge and testimony when the statement in question has been corrected in the second. But this is just what Dr. Whitaker has done, and in full knowledge that Thompson says in his second edition, vol. 1, p. 395, as follows: "Rev. John Youngs, one of the original settlers of the town, was the first minister. He had been a preacher in Hingham, England, came to New Haven with some of his church in 1640, and in October following removed to this place, where he continued till his decease in 1672, aged seventy-four."

Lambert's History of New Haven is a book of original research, not a compilation from other printed books, and is considered as good authority. He says on p. 180: "Most of the first planters (of Southold) were from Hingham, in Norfolk, Eng., and came to New Haven in the summer of 1640." He also says that "Mr. Youngs reorganized his church at New Haven on the 21st of October, 1640, and with them and such others as chose to accompany him in the latter part of the month passed over to the island and commenced the settlement of the plantation."

G. H. Hollister's History of Connecticut, vol. 1, p. 113, says:

"This plantation (Southold) was commenced under the direction of the Rev. John Youngs, of Hingham, in Norfolk, who arrived in New Haven that summer (1640) with his parishioners, and after reorganizing his church after the plan of that colony, soon set sail for Long Island and commenced a settlement.

Palfrey's well-known and standard history of New England also maintains that the settlers of Southold came from Norwalk county, Eng., and settled here in October, 1640.

Now let us see what Silas Wood says, whose testimony is vaunted when it suits the doctor's opinions. He says, third edition, p. 34: "The Rev. John Youngs was the first minister of Southold. He had been a minister at Hingham, in Norfolk, England, before he emigrated to this country. He came to New Haven with a part of his church, and with them and such as chose to accompany them, in October, passed over to Long Island, and commenced a settlement on a tract of land which had been purchased of the natives under the authority of New Haven."

The painstaking Farmer finds no better authority than Wood on this point, and quotes the above in his Genealogical Register, p. 333.

From Trumbull's History of Connecticut, first edition, 1797, vol. 1, p. 117 (the second edition of 1818 does not vary a single word from the following): "It also appears that New Haven, or their confederates, purchased and settled Yennycock, Southold, on Long Island. Mr. John Youngs, who had been a minister at Hingham, in England, came over with a considerable part of his church, and here fixed his residence. He gathered his church anew, on the 21st of October (1640), and the planters united themselves with New Haven."

Neal's History of New England. Neal speaks of the settlement of Southampton in 1640, but makes no direct mention of that of Southold. (Vol. 1, p. 189.)

In his account of the progress of colonizing of the Massachusetts Bay Puritans, he makes this statement (vol. 1, p. 152): "They (the Massachusetts settlers) seated themselves in the bay, and spread along the coast, where they built first the town of New Haven, which gives name to the colony; and then the towns of Guilford, Milford, Stamford and Branford. After

some time they crossed the bay and made several settlements in Long Island, erecting churches in all places where they came, after the independent form." Now, the settlers of New Haven, on April 8, 1638 (O. S.), spent their first Sunday in their new settlement. Milford was settled in February, 1639; Guilford in November or December, 1639; Stamford in July, 1640, and Branford was purchased in 1638 or 1639, and settled in 1644; and all these four towns were settled from, and under, the jurisdiction of the New Haven colony. So that the settlement of Southold, according to Neal, was subsequent to the latest of these, which was that of Stamford, in July, 1640. This same statement would put Southampton in the same rank if there were not so much overwhelming testimony to the contrary, fixing the time of its settlement to be June, 1640. But if, as seems likely, the author has in mind the colonizing efforts of the New Haven colony, then Southampton need not be included at all in the general statement. Huntington was settled largely by Stamford men.

Now as to the time of Mr. Youngs' arrival in America. Samuel G. Drake, in his Founders of New England, p. 49, has the following record, taken by him from the original entries in London: ["May the 11th, 1637.] The examination of John Yonge of St. Margretts, Suff. minister, aged thirty-five yeares and Joan his wife aged thirty-four years with six children, John, Tho: Anne, Rachell, Marey, and Josueph ar desirous to passe for Salam in New England to inhabitt." (*Against the above entry in the place of the date is written*:) "This man was forbyden passage by the Commissioners and went not from Yarmouth." This entry follows six other entries of May 11, 1637, and is followed by two entries of examination on May 12, 1637.

James Savage's testimony. In the Massachusetts Historical Society's Collections, 4th series, vol. 1, p. 101, we find the same entry word for word, and this copy was made for Mr. Savage by an English gentleman. Mr. Savage adds in a foot-note that this Rev. John Yonge was the minister who came over "three years later" and settled at Southold. Two independent copyists thus say he was refused a passage in 1637.

So far we have treated the settlement of Southold as all other

writers have done—assuming that it was *settled* just when Mr. Youngs and his company went there from New Haven and occupied, after the purchase by Gov. Eaton. But Dr. Whitaker has two strings to his bow. If we prove the settlement to have been in October, then he responds, "but there was a Matthew Sunderland here in 1639, and a Richard Jackson on the 15th of August, 1640, obtained a deed of Farrett for his land in Southold, and these antedate the Southampton settlement." We will first suppose this statement to be valid, and answer even then, if the coming of one man makes a settlement of a town, then must Southold yield priority to East Hampton, inasmuch as Lyon Gardiner purchased Gardiner's Island and occupied it in the early spring of 1640. The date of the purchase deed is March 10, 1639 (O. S.), which means 1640. But every writer dates the settlement of East Hampton from 1648, when the site of the present town was purchased of the Indians and occupied by a company of emigrants from Southampton, increased by accessions from Southold, and from the New Haven, Connecticut, and Massachusetts Bay colonies. Now as to Richard Jackson, Dr. Whitaker says he obtained a deed of Farrett, August 15, 1640, for land in Southold. Well, Southampton obtained its deed from Farrett on June 12, 1640. So Mr. Jackson is disposed of. And now for Sunderland. Our author says he took a lease of land on the 18th of June, 1639, of the agent of Lord Stirling, the same Farrett before mentioned. He adds that on the 4th of September, 1639, he took a receipt for rent thereon. Of the last date and its transaction (if it was not rent paid in advance) I will say, if there is not something crooked, something false or erroneous,*

*Since writing the above, I have, through a friend, consulted the Southold records, and find that the lease to Sunderland of June 18, 1639, is for an island in the town of Oyster Bay, for which he was to pay £20 per year. The other lease of the same date was of two little necks of land, the one on the east side of Oyster Bay harbor, the other on west side of said harbor, at ten shillings per year. There is little reason to doubt that this date of June 18, 1639, was really June 18, 1640, as would appear from the citation from the London documents of the Colonial History of New York (vol. 3, pp. 21, 22), given in the text. To this statement I append a copy of a paper in the office of the Secretary of State in General Entries, vol. 1, p. 63. And the reader will notice that this document also speaks of the sale of land at Cow Bay, to Howe and the Southampton settlers, as having been in the year 1639. When I discovered

I will surrender the whole question. Of the first, it is simply unpardonable for any man as well informed as Dr. Whitaker to go on citing the dates of the London documents, which all the world knows are one year in error concerning the Long Island history (see Brodhead's History of N. Y., vol. 1, p. 760). To show his want of candor, or rather to show what is true history, I cite two authorities on this point:

---

this confirmation of what I have maintained for years, and saw there was absolutely no foundation for believing any European to be a resident at Yennicott when the Lynn pilgrims landed at North Sea in June, 1640, to plant a colony on Long Island, called from the first, Southampton, I felt like keeping silence —but the publication of this history of Southold, advancing such preposterous claims that would appear good to the world at large, determined me to put forth the true narration of the episode of the the early history of the island.

[From General Entries, Vol. I, p. 63.]

Whereas a warrant was issued forth under my hand bearing date the 20th of October last [1664], for John Conckling to make his personall appearance before me on a certaine day, to show his title and claime to a parcell of lands on Long Island, in difference betweene the said John Conckling and Govert Lookermans of this towne, and both ptyes this day having produced severall deeds and writings to prove their titles to the lands in question (that is to say), John Conckling on his pte, brought a copie of a letter of attorney bearing date Aprill 20th, 1637, made by William Earle, of Sterling, to James fforrett, to be his agent for the letting, setting, or selling of any pte of Long Island for the use of the said Earle, &c. In pursuance whereof, the said James fforrett sold upon the 18th of June, 1639, unto Mathew Sunderland, his heirs and assigns for ever, for the rent of ten shillings p. ann. the two necks of land which make Oyster Bay, the one of the east, the other of the west side thereof, the said Mathew Sunderland paying three yeares rent to James fforrett, as his by acquittances doth appeare, dyes, and his widow layes claime to it as a chattell, (which I am informed is the custome of the country to esteeme of wilderness land as such), and leaves it to several children by another husband. There were also two depositions, the one from William Cooling to prove ye sale of the said two necks of land by the said James fforrett to Mathew Sunderland, entered in the records at South-hold, Anno, 1662, the 20th of Aprill. The other by Thomas Terry, to prove the sachems avowing in 1639, that they sold Matinecock* to James fforrett, and Capt. Howe cum sociis. Govert Lookermans on his part, produced several deedes to prove his purchase, but noue before the yeare 1650 and his land briefe in 1659, wch, being so many yeares after the former grants, I have thought fitt to order and appoint, and by these psnts do order and appoint that John Conckling being now in possession in behalfe of the orphans, at present hee is to continue, yet in regard the said Govert Lookermans hath made appeare his real purchase of the premises, and he having had possession and recd rent for the said lands for five yeares last past, the said Govert Lookermans shall have liberty (when the generall court shall be settled on the said island), to make his claime and title to appeare before them at their first sitting, whereof both ptes shall have two monethes advertizement and the difference is no further concluded by this order, but from the said court is to receive a definitive sentence without further appeale.

Given under my hand at ffort James, in New York, on the Island of Manhatans, this 22d day of November, 1664. RICHARD NICOLLS.

---

*Matinnecock was a broad neck of land between Cow Bay and Oyster Bay.

1552957

1. From Chalmers' Political Annals, p. 571: "In June, 1639, Forrest, the agent of Earl Stirling, transferred a considerable part of the eastern extremity of Long Island to Howell and his associates, with such powers of government as had been communicated to that nobleman by the Plymouth Company." In support of this statement (perhaps the very words) Chalmers cites the New York papers, Plantation Office, Whitehall, Lond., vol. 1, p. 1.

2. From the Colonial History of New York, vol. 3, pp. 21, 22: "A deed of conveyance of land on Long Island covering the town of Southampton, to Edward Howell & Co., is here recorded of date June 12, 1639, and signed by James Farrett, (the Forrest of the former extract) as the agent of the Earl of Stirling." This instrument says further: "They (the settlers) being drove off by the Dutch from the place where they were planted by me to their great damage," etc., referring to fact that eight men under the charter or deed of Farrett first attempted a settlement at Cow Bay in what is now Huntington, and were compelled to abandon their attempt by the Dutch, and then proceeded to the east end of Long Island.

Now Dr. Whitaker says that Sunderland's lease was dated the 18th of June, 1639, six days subsequent to the sale of land to the settlers of Southampton. Furthermore on the same page (p. 22) as above is recorded a copy of Stirling's confirmation of the sale of the land to Howell and his associates, dated the 20th of August, 1639. This confirmation embraces also the sale of land to John, Thomas and Edward Farrington, and also of land to Matthew Sunderland. It does not tell where the land of Sunderland was located, but it fixes the date of the year of this sale to be the same as that of Southampton. If Sunderland purchased his land in 1639, then Southampton was settled in 1639. These London documents, as I have said, are in error of one year. Southampton was settled in 1640 and Sunderland's first purchase or lease was also in 1640, and if his purchase amounts to a settlement of Southold, and if the dates of the settlement of the two towns are to be fixed by the dates of the instrument of sale by Farrett to Howell & Co., and of lease or sale to Sunderland, then the settlement of Southampton occurred on June 12, 1640, and that of Southold on the 18th of June, 1640. But the world

will still hold that Southold was settled only when the Rev. John Youngs and his company went to Yennicot in the last of October, 1640, and actually occupied the land for the first time.

This document speaks of the Southampton people being driven off by the Dutch from Cow Bay in the spring of 1639. The Dutch documents describe the same event as occurring in May, 1640, and furthermore say that the English taken prisoners to New Amsterdam were, after an examination, dismissed on Saturday, May 19. Now, May 19, 1640, by the Dutch reckoning, they having some time before adopted the new style or Gregorian calendar, would fall on a Saturday; but May 19, 1639, fell on a Thursday; May 19, 1639, according to the English or old style, fell on Sunday. This incidental mention of the day of the week by the Dutch records fixes the date of the attempt at a settlement at Cow Bay and the expulsion to have been in the year 1640. The same deed of the London documents, therefore, which cites the purchases of Sunderland and of the Southampton settlers, mentioning the very expulsion from Cow Bay, and cites these as both occurring in 1639, is in error of one year. And Dr. Whitaker knows of this discrepancy, and yet keeps on dating Sunderland's purchase in 1639, but generously allows the correction of the date to be applied to Southampton. The English records in the office of the Secretary of State at Albany also correct the dates of the London documents. In the MS. book marked "Court of Assizes," vol. 2, p. 439, is recorded the first deed to the Southampton settlers, of date April 17, 1640, under which they were to take up eight miles square of land, where they should select, on Long Island. This record gives the date 1640, and not 1639, thus being in harmony with the Dutch records.

It is very disagreeable to have to say what I have said, but, with all the cloud of witnesses with me, I know I am right and he is wrong.

Now let us determine from all the authorities that mention the subject the time of the settlement of Southampton.

Thompson's History of Long Island, second edition, vol. 1, p. 326: "After the settlement was broken up there (at Cow Bay), as related by Winthrop. Howe and his companions came here (to Southampton) and bargained with the natives for the land, and

the better to make sure of their purchase immediately advanced a part of the price. The payment of the balance was not arranged till December 13, 1640, when a conveyance was obtained, and the settlement progressed." This deed of December 13, 1640, by the way, mentions the fact that a part of the consideration for the land had already been paid to the Indians.

Felt, in his Ecclesiastical History of New England, vol. 1, p. 417, says:

"1640, June. Some members of the Lynn Church went to Long Island and purchased a plantation at its western end from the agent of Lord Stirling. But the Dutch, who claimed it, displacing them, they repaired to the eastern part of the island and took steps to form a church. This place was subsequently called South Hampton. Abraham Pierson received a call to become their minister. He was from Yorkshire; had his A. B. at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1632; came to Boston, 1639; joined the church there September 5, 1640, and had leave the next October 11 from them to join in gathering a church at Long Island. But a small part of the company there, being at Lynn, he unites with them, in November, as a church, and then proceeds to their settlement on the island."

Abiel Holmes, in his American Annals (vol. 1, p. 314), after giving the common account of the attempt of the Lynn men to settle on the west end of Long Island, finishes the narrative as follows:

"Provoked by this indignity (the fool's face set up in place of the arms of the Prince of Orange), the Dutch sent soldiers, who brought off the Englishmen and imprisoned them; but after a few days, having taken an oath of them, they set them at liberty. The adventurers now removed to the east end of the island, where, to the number of forty families, they settled the town of Southampton."

Hubbard's History of New England (chap. 33) adds no light on the exact time of the settlement, but tells the story substantially as the other New England historians, and puts the settlement in 1640, but gives no clue to the month or season of the year in which this occurred, except to mention the fact that after the expulsion from Cow Bay they went at once to the east end of Long Island and settled.

In Neal's History of New England (vol. 1, p. 189) the same story is told of the attempts to settle at Cow Bay, the expulsion of the settlers, and their immediate removal to the east end of Long Island. No date is given more definite than "about this time," with 1640 in the margin to indicate the year in which the events occurred.

Cotton Mather, in his Magnalia, in giving an account of Abraham Pierson, gives the same outlines as Hubbard, Neal and Holmes, and like them speaks of the settlement of Southampton following immediately the expulsion from Cow Bay.

Ogilby says, in his History of America, p. 161: "About the year 1617 (1637) a new supply coming over into these parts, and not finding in the Massachusetts Government any commodious place to settle in, they after much search, took up a place somewhat more southerly.....They erected a new government which from their first fronteer town, being the seventeenth [settled by the English Puritans] was called Newhaven".....

"About the year 1640, by a fresh supply of people that settled in Long Island, was there erected the twenty-third town, called Southampton; by the Indians, Agawom."

From Edward Johnson's Wonder-working Providence. (In Massachusetts Historical Society's Collections, 2d series, vol. 7, p. 22):

"Chapter XVII of the planting of Long Island." Such is the heading of the chapter giving an account of the settlement of Southampton. This language would be inapplicable to Southampton unless it was the first pioneer settlement on the island. If Southold had been planted, then the heading would have been "Of the planting of the second town, or church, on Long Island."

Lechford's Plaine dealing, or Newes from New England. In the reprint of 1867, p. 101, is a brief mention of the planting of Long Island. He says: "Long Island is begun to be planted and some two ministers are gone thither or to goe, as one master Pierson, and master Knowles, that was at Dover, alias Northam. A church was gathered for that island at Lynne, etc." Lechford says nothing of the Southold settlement.

From Winthrop's Journal or History of New England, 1st ed., 1790, p. 204; or edition of Savage, 1853. Vol. 2, p. 5.

"1640. Mo[nth] 4. Divers of the inhabitants of Linne finding themselves straitened looked out for a new plantation, and going to Long Island, they agreed with the Lord Stirling's agent there, one Mr. Forrett for a parcell of the isle near the west end, and agreed with the Indians for their right. The Dutch hearing of this and making claim to that part of the island by a former purchase of the Indians, sent men to take possession of the place, and set up the arms of the Prince of Orange upon a tree. The Linne men sent ten or twelve men with provisions, &c., who began to build and took down the Prince's arms, and in place thereof an Indian had drawn an unhandsome face. The Dutch took this in high displeasure, and sent soldiers and fetched away their men and imprisoned them in a few days, and then took an oath of them and so discharged them. [This discharge was o. s. May 9, 1640, or n. s. May 19.] Upon this the Linne men finding themselves too weak and having no encouragement to expect aid from the English, desisted that place, and took another at the east end of the same island, and being now about 40 families, they proceeded in their plantation, and called one Mr. Pierson a godly learned man, and a member of the church of Boston to go with them."

The testimony of all these historians is thus unanimous in support of the settlement of Southampton in the first half of June, 1640, and of the settlement of Southold in the last half of October of the same year. Now let Dr. Whitaker persist, if he will, in the claim to the priority of the settlement of Southold. The testimony is before the world, and my task is done.

ALBANY, *Jan.* 10, 1882. GEO. R. HOWELL.